Working Paper Series

QUO VADIS: The Navy and
Organization Development

by

Raymond L. Forbes, Jr.

THE HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California

QUO VADIS: The Navy and Organization Development

by

Raymond L. Forbes, Jr.

* This paper was presented at the Fifth Psychology in the Air Force Symposium, United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado, April 8, 1976.

HRM FACULTY

A. CORE GROUP

- C. Brooklyn Derr, Ed.D., Harvard, "Organization and Career Development, Conflict Management"
- Carson K. Eoyang, Ph.D., Stanford, "Organizational Theory and Development"
- Raymond L. Forbes, Ph.D., United States International University, LCDR, USN, "Motivation Psychology and Organization Development"
- Charles B. "Gus" Gustafson, M.S. Math, M.S. Management, Naval Postgraduate School, CDR, USN, "Methodology and Organization Development"
- Richard A. McGonigal, Ph.D., Michigan State, CDR, USN, "Intercultural and Interpersonal Communications and Organization Development"
- Chester A. Wright, M.S., UCLA, "Equal Opportunity and Race Relations, Community Organization, Drug Abuse"

B. ADJUNCT

- Roger Harrison, Ph.D., U.C. Berkeley, "Organization Development, Power and Influence, Self-Directed Experiential Learning"

C. ASSOCIATES

- James K. Arima, Ph.D., Northwestern, "Industrial Psychology"
- Richard S. Elster, Ph.D., Minnesota, "Personnel Psychology and Manpower Planning"
- William J. Haga, Ph.D., Illinois, "Sociology and Bureaucracy"
- Edward J. Laurence, Ph.D., Pennsylvania, "Research Methods"
- John D. Senger, Ph.D., Illinois, "Leadership and Social Psychology"

ABSTRACT

The United States Navy became involved with Organization Development on a system wide basis in the early 1970's. The impact of accelerating technological and social changes occurring in the larger culture of the country appeared to be the main precipitating factors. From a pilot program begun by the Chief of Naval Operations in 1971, the Navy effort in Organization Development has expanded into a world wide program principally aimed at improving the effectiveness of the operating forces. This planned change effort has proceeded through a recognizable series of growth stages to reach its present proportions.

The present approach called, "Survey Guided Development," is seen to contain elements of major strategies previously identified by organizational theorists for changing human systems. The Navy developmental program calls for a chronologically sequenced series of discrete steps designed to assist individual units in producing and implementing individual action plans. The process uses human resource management specialists acting in the role of consultant to the individual unit's commanding officer.

These consultant specialists are especially trained, active-duty, Navy men and women who operate in small teams. They are administered from centers located in areas of major concentration of fleet units. Units are scheduled for the full program, known as the "Human Resource Management Cycle," on a non-voluntary basis as part of the routine operational scheduling process.

Significant among the present problems of the Navy program is the measurement of results in ways that indicate visible impact on the traditionally used criteria of organizational effectiveness. Some initial attempts at measurement

show promise of correlating survey results with operational mission effectiveness yardsticks. Long term future support of this Navy developmental program appears to be keyed to its ability to demonstrate its worth in cost effectiveness terms. Continuation of the present effort into the near term future seems to be related to its ability to successfully compete for the required survival resources in the light of an increasing cost consciousness and an overall decrease in organizational size.

The typical reaction to the Navy being involved in Organization Development may be likened to the chauvinistic question sometimes asked of single women in bars, "What's a nice girl like you doing in a place like this?" After all, aren't military institutions the leading standard bearers for a particularly virulent form of bureaucratic organizational leadership that traces its history to the Roman legions and the Holy Catholic Church? Isn't the military one of the nation's staunchest defenders of the "status quo"? What is our country's protector of the sea lanes doing mixed up in "this crazy OD business" anyhow? The attempt of this paper will be to speak to the why, what, who, where, and when of the Navy's involvement in Organization Development or OD.

PROLOG

The impact of the acceleration of change has been considerable on today's social institutions. Big organizations, including the military, have become increasingly involved in coping with the consequences of the change process as a means of continuing to achieve their purposes in our complex age. Accelerating change, principally in the spheres of technology and social values, has produced pressures that appear to threaten the very foundations of modern organizational structures. In reference to these threatened foundations, organizational consultant Peter Drucker (Drucker, 1969) has stated:

> The traditional assumptions are being outmoded by independent--or at least only partially dependent--new developments in our society, in our economy, and in the world view of our age, especially in the industrialized countries. To a large extent. objective reality is changing around the manager's role -- and fast. Today we need quite different assumptions--more in keeping with today's realities.

Of growing concern to large scale institutions in the United States today is a particular aspect of the change condition, that of the influence of change on the human side of the organization. Complexly structured organizations in the form of giant business corporations, huge labor unions, international industrial cartels, and the agencies of the federal government dominate to an ever increasing extent the quality of life in our American Society. Accelerating organizational change has become a not-quite legitimate occurrence that is seen as a severe threat by many persons in these big institutions. In response to ever increasing environmental change pressures in their surrounding environments, organizations have adopted strategies to control change that range within a spectrum of complete apathy to enlightened attempts at systematic constructive channeling. Attempts to deal with change forces threatening the status quo have generated high magnitude stresses and strains in many of our societies' organizational monoliths.

Organizational researcher David Bowers (Bowers, 1969), in a monograph on organizations, directs his attention to this problem:

> It is the central point of this paper that organizations and their ability to function effectively are not separate from the problems of organizational development or change. The study of organizations is, in reality, the study of fluctuation, adaption, and change by social entities.

Symptomatic of contemporary organizational problems of a social nature are minority group unrest, automation of jobs, concern for ecology, demands for more leisure time, a more educated work force, an increasingly transient population, demands of the disadvantaged for increased power sharing, and a rejection by the young of the Protestant work ethic. These pressures for change have produced some disturbing results as large organizations have either inadequately moved or resisted meeting them. A loss of confidence in leadership has shaken the country; black political power has become a reality, as

has the Women's Liberation Movement; the unemployment rate remains alarmingly high; automation has produced job displacement and a need for work re-education; shorter work weeks are being utilized on a wider scale; many colleges and universities have had to close their doors as others only marginally survive; longstanding moral values come under increasing attack; and the young turn to drugs, question the establishment's authority, adopt unconventional life styles, and demand personal meaning from what they do. Organizational leadership must now daily face the challenge of the constructive management of change. Unchecked, random, and powerful change forces can result in a destructive climate that is the antithesis of the environmental stability that large scale organization currently demands. Corporation president, Henry B. Schact, (Schact, 1970), summarizies one such constructive position for organizational leadership to take:

> The prospect of dealing with change in the seventies is upsetting to some of us; many people would like to see the pace diminished to the point where it is no longer a problem. It is likely, however, that we are only beginning to see the real effects of change in our society; rather than slowing down, the pace is about to accelerate in ways that none of us probably really understand or know how to cope with. While many of us would like to see the turmoil and chaos of the sixties replaced by serenity in the seventies, it is doubtful that a calmer pace, which would not be very exciting anyway, is possible in the world today.

The enroachments of unplanned change challenge the ability of the organization to successfully adapt to its environment. Progressive maladaption to societal change processes weakens the organization's capacity to compete for the resources needed for its survival. This weakening produces a resultant impairment in the organization's ability to carry out its purpose for existence in an ever debilitating cycle. Dealing with the issue of change poses difficult questions for our institutions. What are organizations doing about the problem of change? Are there better ways of handling

the change process?

Harnessing change to meet organizational needs is the essence of the whole problem of accelerating change. Organizational consultant Michael Michaelis (Michaelis, 1971) succinctly sketches this requirement to manage change:

> In pursuit of national and corporate objectives, both government and industry share this common concern to stimulate innovation and change. Since, in most cases, we cannot really be sure what kind of changes will prove most useful, government and industry must experiment--jointly as far as possible. Or to put it more realistically, those of us who are temperamentally fitted for it must experiment and the rest of us must tolerate it, even encourage it. Change is the only constant in the world of tomorrow. We must learn to manage change as brilliantly as we have learned to accomplish scientific advances.

One large contemporary organization, the U. S. Navy, may serve as a representative model of a big bureaucracy attempting to cope with the management of change problem. The U. S. Navy is an almost 600,000 person organization deep in the throes of change. Its many faceted difficulties in the 1970's reflect both on the large American society of which it is a part and also upon those things which are unique to it as a modern military organization. Some of these problems can be seen to result from pressures originating in the larger society external to itself and others that are primarily internal in nature.

In the region of external pressures lie such items as changing social values, proliferating technology, rising inflation and unemployment, growing Soviet seapower, the international drug trade, concern for environmental protection, demands for proportional representation of minority groups at all influence levels, budget and personnel cutbacks, egalitarian women's

rights, and a decreasing positive public image of the military. Vice Admiral David Bagley, former Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, commented on the magnitude of the changes confronting the Navy (Bagley, 1971):

> We are now faced with building the Navy of the 1970's and 1980's. We are committed to a smaller, more effective force. Certainly technology will continue to play a vital role in the building of that Navy. The same technology will also increase the need to attract and retain bright effective people. We must, therefore, begin to utilize the talent and potential of every Navyman more effectively or we cannot hope to reach this objective. The Navy, like many large institutions, is faced with the need to change and adapt in a changing world. These changes can be revolutionary and potentially destructive, or they can be anticipated and productive. The necessity for the later is readily apparent. There are many lessons which have been learned within this area during the past ten years. A major challenge to the professional Naval leader of the 1970's is the identification and application of this knowledge.

Some of the primarily internally focussed change pressures on the Navy are: an erosion of traditional personnel benefits, adaption to the "All Volunteer Force," smaller sized operational and support forces with approximately the same level of obligations, low retention rates, increased cost-consciousness, prevention of racial incidents, abuse of drugs, service-person alcoholics, overseas basing of units, block obsolescence of ships, and alienated young officers and enlisted people.

The need for an effective institutional response to these external and internal change pressures has become an ever more pressing priority issue for the Navy's leadership. A senior Naval Officer, Rear Admiral Allen A. Bergner has perhaps best summarized the Navy's concern about managing change. Referring to a considerable amount of retention research analysis, the Admiral stated (Bergner, 1969):

> As a result of the above research, we determined that to effectively manage a large organization and to keep our people, we must counter the sociological and other subtle changes which have created the apathetic attitude on the part of our managers at all levels of management.

Thus, the Navy like other large contemporary organizational structures finds itself faced with the problem of adapting to the impact of the accelerating rate of change on its human and material resources. It must successfully adapt while continuing to carry out its assigned missions of maintaining a seagoing capability for strategic deterrence, controlling the seas to keep vital sea lanes open, projecting armed forces overseas if needed, and maintaining a naval presence wherever it is required overseas.

THE BEGINNINGS

The Navy organizational structure in mid-1970 under the hegemony of the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, began a thorough, critical, self-examination. Long-standing policies and procedures were examined in the harsh light of their relevance to the Navy of the present and the future. Introspection on such a grand scale created a great deal of internal and external controversy. Within and without the Navy, the conservative traditionalists reacted with shock and anger, the liberals with energetic support, and the midle-of-the roaders with a wait-and-see posture.

As a result of his personal motivation, the outputs of numerous retention study groups, and from recommendations generated within the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Admiral Zumwalt issued one of his personal messages to the Navy. This message, NAVOP Z-55, transmitted to the Navy in November 1970, stated in part (Zumwalt, 1970):

> My deep belief that the Navy's greatest resource lies in our Human Assets has been previously stated and is the backbone of my efforts in the personnel areas to date. Feedback from recent field trips, the retention study groups, and many other sources indicated the desirability of adapting some of the contributions of the behavorial sciences to the effective management of these vital assets. To this end, I have directed the establishment of a Pilot program, involving approximately 24 selected personnel, who will develop and evaluate new ideas and techniques in the Human Relations area. My objective is to improve the management of our Human Resources by enhancing our understanding of and communications with people.

This pilot group of twenty-four, known as the Human Resource Management Program, was selected from the over 1200 Navy volunteers who individually responded to Admiral Zumwalt's message. After six weeks of training that started in January 1971, this group began work on a project that eventually

led to the development of the Navy's first organization-wide planned change effort.

The pilot group, in attempting to carry out its broad organizational charter, examined a wide range of past, existing, and projected ideas from both the military and civilian sectors. After much deliberation, investigation, and analysis, the basic strategy which appeared to show the greatest promise for meeting the objectives of the Chief of Naval Operations was--Organization Development.

An intensive search was then carried out into the current forms and practices of OD. Finally, four avenues were considered to be potentially both realistic and effective:

(1) The Grid Managerial and Organization Development System developed by Drs. Robert Blake and Jane Mouton (Blake and Mouton, 1963),

(2) The Instrumented Survey-Feedback Method utilized by the Institute of Social Research at the University of Michigan. (Bowers and Franklin, 1975),

(3) The Team Development Method, as influenced by McGregor's work at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Bennis, 1969), and

(4) The Laboratory Learning Method, the approach principally employed by the National Training Laboratories, (Mill and Porter, 1972).

At the request of the top Navy leadership a Navy-unique organization development effort was designed by a staff group in late 1971 which incorporated features of all the selected avenues. The design called for

intra-Navy consultants to assist specified units with a seven step organization development program. The program was to be called "Command Development" and it featured a Navy leadership approach called the "N-man-concept." This concept provided to participants in book form (U. S. Navy, 1972) an analysis of leadership styles and their likely consequences to the organization. The main components of this step-sequenced program were:

STEP 1 Introductory Experience	A one week introductory seminar for a cross-sectional representation of the command.
STEP 2 Information Gathering	Organizational climate data gathering with either a survey instrument or personal interviews or through both methods.
STEP 3 Information Analysis	Data analysis using both computer and manual processes.
STEP 4 Analysis Display and Feedback	Data feedback to the unit commanding officer.
STEP 5 Analysis-Interpretation	Data Interpretation by the command consultant team.
STEP 6 Action Program	Development of action programs arising from issues identified during data interpretation and feedback.
STEP 7 Evaluation Program	Assessment of the overall developmental effort.

Different steps of the command development design were locally tested on volunteering Navy units in the Newport, Rhode Island area during the period January - May 1972. A larger scale, six month field test was ordered conducted by the Chief of Naval Personnel using selected staffs and six ships of Cruiser Destroyer Flotilla Two. The test period was from May 1972 until January 1973. User comments were largely mixed at the conclusion of the field test. The evaluation report was generally favorable toward the command development process but critical as to its length, rigidity, and extensive demands upon the time of the units involved (Lyons, 1973). During the spring and summer of 1972, under the control of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, four Human Resource Development Centers (HRDC) were commissioned to provide services to the Naval establishment in the areas of Command Development, Race Relations Education, Drug Abuse Education, and Inter-cultural Relations. Each Human Resource area was separately administered but jointly coordinated through the Center Commanding Officer.

Access to the Command Development Program was provided by especially trained Navy consultants to units voluntarily requesting it through each HRDC. Delivery of the seven-step program continued throughout 1972, including the Newport field test. The Human Resource Management pilot group was dissolved in January 1972. Several of its former members constituted the nucleus of the first HRDC in April of 1972 as the Command Development Department. A ten-week training program for Command Development consultants was initially formulated by members of the Newport HRDC in the early spring of 1972 and turned over to a civilian consulting firm in the middle of that year. Approximately one hundred Navy officers and enlisted persons were trained in organization development procedures through this method. The training program initially employed both civilian and Navy instructors. The

civilian staff role was gradually reduced until military members assumed complete control of the entire training process.

In the spring of 1973, at the direction of Rear Admiral Charles Rauch, the Director of the Navy Human Relations Development Project Office, a Navy Human Goals program was conceived. The program called for consolidation of many existing Human Resource Management programs into one effort, including Command Development. It was designed to extend the Navy's Personal Affairs Action Programs of 1970. This new initiative incorporated selected plans and programs to meet CNO objectives in support of the Department of Defense Human Goals Credo.

The resulting Human Goals Plan (Weisner, 1973) called for a sweeping reorganization of effort and a change in program focus. Navy units afloat and ashore were now assigned specific responsibilities for practical training and application to improve the use of their own human resources. The plan stressed first principles: leadership and professionalism; responsibility; authority and accountability; good order and discipline, morale, and spirit; and pride in uniform.

Under the plan's provisions, HRDC's were renamed Human Resource Management Centers (HRMC's) and placed under the operational control of the fleet commanders. The necessary material, fiscal, and personnel assets were provided to the fleet commanders under transfer agreements to implement the new program. Training responsibilities in human resource management areas were transferred to the Chief of Naval Education and Training. New centers were commissioned in Washington, D. C., and London, England, to support the Navy's shore establishment and European-based forces, respectively. Smaller, relatively self-contained, Human Resource Management Detachments (HRMD) were established in some local areas reporting to a HRMC.

The HRMD's provided the same services as the parent HRMC but to a more localized population. An inspection program in the area of Human Goals was established through the office of the Navy Inspector General. One of the expressed aims of the new Human Goals Plan was to, in the near-term, shift the previous specialist-administered program requirements into normal responsibilities of the Navy's leadership structure. The major intended outcomes of the plan were to achieve (Weisner, 1973):

- Increased awareness by the personnel of the Navy of the importance of the Human Goals Credo and the need for the highest standards of personal conduct.
- An improved state of unit readiness.
- Improved communications at all levels in the chain of command.
- Improved image of the Navy as a professional organization which recognizes the worth and dignity of the individual and his family.
- Improved leadership and human resource management practices at all levels.
- Improved career and job satisfaction.
- Full involvement of the chain of command in all efforts to improve the productivity and effectiveness of its human resources.
- Insurance of uniformity and equality in application of discipline, Military justice and administrative practices.
- Increased understanding and acceptance among Navy personnel and their dependents of the host nation's culture and customs resulting in a
  - reduction of adverse overseas incidents and
  - increased overseas tour satisfaction and productivity.
- Increased ability of all Navy personnel to recognize the symptoms and dangers of alcohol and drug abuse which lead to reduced performance, disciplinary infractions, health and family problems, accidents, injuries and death.
- Recognition of alcoholism as an illness, treatable without stigma, and promotion of the acceptance and meaningful employment of successfully rehabilitated personnel as effective members of the Navy Community.
- Reduction of the incidence of drug and alcohol abuse by military members and dependents to obtain lower treatment loads, less lost time due to abuse, reduction in urinalysis testing and other drug and alcohol control program costs.

- Development of a Human Goals Action Plan by all commands,
- Improved retention of quality personnel.

The Command Development Program was restructured into a mandatory, formally scheduled, organizational improvement system entitled, "The Human Resource Management Cycle." HRMC human resources were reorganized and retrained to deliver the new program prior to January 1974. Pilot tests with operational units were scheduled for three HRMC's in the fall of 1973. These highly successful tests demonstrated the viability of the system for fleet use. Regular scheduling of fleet units for the cycle was initiated in January of 1974.

THE PRESENT PICTURE

The Navy's current Organization Development effort is directed toward improved organizational effectiveness. It gives priority to the individual operating unit and is administered through the provisions of a Chief of Naval Operations directive titled the "Human Resource Management Support System" (Shear, 1975). This directive is essentially an updated and more streamlined revision of the Navy Human Goals Plan.

The present program is worldwide in scope and utilizes approximately three hundred full time Human Resource Management (OD) Specialists. The specialists are about equally divided between officer and enlisted persons and includes ethnic and female minority group members. Specialists are brought into the program for a normal tour of shore duty on the basis of their fleet experience, demonstrated performance, and potential to do the work. Most are volunteers; officer grades range from Commander (O-5) to Lieutenant (O-3) and enlisted ranks from Master Chief Petty Officer (E-9) to Petty Officer First Class (E-6).

Basic specialist training is provided by the Human Resource Management School, Memphis, Tennessee. The twelve week curriculum emphasizes consulting skills, survey analysis and feedback, and workshop preparation and delivery. On-the-job training is conducted by the HRMC/D's as well as skill update training. Limited additional knowledge and skill training is available to the specialist through civilian contractors and extra Navy courses. Demonstrated professional proficiency in the HRM area, backed by the specialized schooling, may result in a Navy Technical Specialist (P-Code) designation for officers and the assignment of a Navy Enlisted Code (NEC) for the enlisted persons. Especially well qualified officers may be selected by a

professional screening board for the designation "proven subspecialist" under the provisions of the Navy's Officer-Technical-Management (OTMS) System. These designations constitute both recognition for achievement as well as a planning consideration factor for subsequent Navy assignments.

The heart of the Navy OD System is the Human Resource Management Cycle and its incorporated five continuous day operational period called a Human Resource Availability (HRAV). To date approximately 50% of the Pacific Fleet and 45% of the Atlantic Fleet have undergone a HRM Cycle. The cycle employs as its basis a process called "Survey Guided Development" (Pecorella, Hausse, and Wissler, 1974). The process is a specialized modification of the instrument survey approach to organization development devised by Likert and his colleagues at the Institute of Social Research (ISR), University of Michigan (Likert, 1967).

The Navy Human Resource Management Survey is a joint Navy-ISR venture patterened after the ISR developed "Survey of Organizations". (Taylor and Bowers, 1972). It is presently in its third revision form and is available in an 88 question sea version and a 103 question shore version. It measures respondent perceptions along a five choice Likert-type scale (Likert, 1961) to singly posed questions. The questions are further arranged into indices, and the indices further ordered into dimensions. The major dimensions are command climate, supervisory leadership, peer group leadership, work group processes, end results, and human goals. The HRM survey has been extensively studied and analyzed for reliability and validity (Franklin, 1973) (Drexler, 1974) (Thomas, 1975). Individual demographic data collected coincident with the HRM survey, coupled with a flexible computer analysis program, enable a wide range of printout options for diagnostic purposes (Hooper, 1974). Standardized data printouts provide the command with statistically arranged information on the entire

organization, by separate departments, by ethnic groupings, and by paygrades. Data is also available in two basic varieties: systemic (overall) and work-group (natural organizational work teams). Specialized data runs based on specific combinations of demographic characteristics are available on request (e.g., comparisons of first term enlistees with career junior petty officers).

Confidentiality of survey information is assured on two levels: the command and the individual respondent. The former is guaranteed by an official Navy directive (U. S. Navy, 1974) and the latter by the computer program which will not respond to data retrieval requests for less than four individuals. To provide the reader with a more detailed view of the Human Resource Management Cycle, the following description is provided in rhetorical question form. Some slight variations in HRM cycle delivery exist between HRMC's due to fleet and regional policy differences.

What is It?

The HRM cycle is a chronologically sequenced series of overlapping action steps tailored to assist commanding officers in improving the overall effectiveness of their units. The cyclic sequence is roughly patterned after the organizational consultation model developed by Kolb and Frohman (Kolb and Frohman, 1970). The HRM cycle is provided to individual fleet units under the auspices of the cognizant fleet commander about once every 18-24 months. Individual units are assigned to the HRM cycle as part of the normal quarterly operational scheduling process based upon recommendations from individual Type (e.g., surface ships, submarines, and aircraft) commanders. Once a unit is scheduled the services of a HRMC or HRMD are assigned to assist the commanding officer throughout all cycle

phases. Centers are located in London, England; Norfolk, Virginia; Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; San Diego, California; and Washington, D. C. (for shore activities). Detachments are presently situated in Naples, Italy; Rota, Spain; Charleston, South Carolina; Mayport, Florida; Guam; Subic Bay, Philippines; Yokosuka, Japan; and Alameda, California.

What Are Its Essential Features?

- Data gathering through a mandatory Human Resource Management Survey which contains provision for employing up to 30 optional questions of specific command interest. Supporting personal interviews may also be conducted at the discretion of the commanding officer.

- Computer data compilation of the survey responses; providing statistical readouts for six major dimensions along 25 separate indices. Comparison of the computed averages to overall Navy and other reference group mean values (norms) are available upon request.

- HRMC/D assistance to the command's personnel in survey analysis, interpretation, and data feedback.

- HRMC/D assistance to the organization in developing a tailored design for the scheduled HRAV. Basing of the unit approved design on survey results and other needs identified by the command's leadership structure.

- Services of the HRMC/D staff as facilitators in the actual delivery of the approved HRAV design.

- A six to twelve month follow-up visit following the HRAV initiated by the assisting HRMC/D to assess results and determine additional assistance requirements.

- The availability of expert consulting resources during the cycle to the commanding officer in the areas of Organizational Development and Management, Equal Opportunity and Race Relations, Drug and Alcohol Abuse Education, and Overseas Diplomacy.

How Does It Work? (A Typical Cycle Sequence)

Following formal operational scheduling introductory materials are forwarded to the command by mail approximately 6-8 weeks prior to the HRAV week. A consulting team from within the cognizant HRMC/D is assigned primary responsibility to service the unit. Next, an introductory meeting (approximately 1-1½ hours) is scheduled between the assigned HRMC/D consultants and the unit commanding officer. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss details of the cycle as well as explore mutual expectations and responsibilities. Generally, at this time arrangements for giving the HRM Survey and the use of optional questions are finalized. The survey is usually given to all available crew members of the command within one month of the meeting. Computer processing and preliminary HRMC/D analysis normally are completed within a week's time dependent upon the unit's size. When initial analysis has been accomplished, the HRMC/D consultants set up for a feedback of the survey data in a meeting with the commanding officer (about 1-1½ hours). Based upon the desires of the commanding officer, survey data may be fed back further down the chain of command to the division and individual workgroup levels. Command copies of the survey data may also be made available for

further internal analysis on board the unit. This is characteristically followed by a survey feedback meeting with the command's department heads. After some time (about 2-7 days) to further review the survey information, a meeting is scheduled with the commanding officer, department heads, and the HRMC/D consultants to explore the meaning of the data, discuss issues surfaced during the feedback sessions, and to identify potential areas for improvement. During this meeting possible alternatives to be used during the HRAV are discussed, Based on the ideas generated at this meeting, the HRMC/D consultants prepare design options for the HRAV. In about a week the consultants meet again with the commanding officer to go over the proposed designs and to select the desired alternative. The HRMC/D consultants then extensively detail and prepare for the delivery of the finalized design during the HRAV (approximately 1-2 weeks later). This period is also used by the unit to allocate the people, time, and spaces required to support the chosen design. The HRAV week is then conducted by the HRMC/D staff. A typical HRAV week design (Forbes, 1974) might consist of a series of short workshops in such areas as communications, leadership, motivation, time management, management by objectives, decision making, problem solving and planning. Specialty presentations and consulting in individual human goals' areas may be incorporated into the week's design. Approximately six to twelve months after the HRAV, the HRMC/D initiaties a letter request for a follow-up visit. The follow-up visit is usually conducted by the consultants on board the unit face-to-face with the commanding officer. The visit may last 1-2 hours gathering evaluation data and determining the need for additional services.

What Does It Cost?

- The commanding officer's time and attention during several pre-HRAV meetings and his participation in HRAV activities.
- Department head's time for taking the survey, analyzing and interpreting it, feeding data back to division officers, and their possible participation in selected HRAV activities.
- Crew time in taking the survey (about one hour each) and selected participation in the HRAV week; approximate average percentage of total crew involvement during the HRAV is 15-40% for a 2-5 day period.
- About 30 minutes' time for workshop participant groups prior to the start of the HRAV for pre-briefing by HRMC/D staff and command representatives.
- Some increased workload for those persons who are not involved in HRAV week events.
- Scheduling priority for the involvement of key personnel for designated HRAV sessions.
- Some reduction in the unit's ability to conduct routinely scheduled events during the HRAV.

What Is Gained?

- A new or updated Command Action Plan. (A required, written document addressing significant organizational issues and the planned means to resolve them.).

- A data-based picture of the current state of the human side of the organization.
- An opportunity to identify and examine areas that could result in improved organizational functioning.
- Planning time to focus on critical issues within the command.
- The specialized services of trained resource consultants acting as staff assistants.
- Improved personnel skills and knowledge in the human goals' area
- Some internal capability to sustain the movement toward greater organization effectiveness.

What Reports Are Required?

- A written evaluation of what was accomplished and recommendations for improvement to the type commander following the HRAV by the unit.
- A monthly statistical summary report by the HRMC/D to the Fleet Commander of surveys given and workshops conducted.

To date the HRM cycle has been employed with over 500 Navy commands, both sea and shore based. Unit size has ranged from nuclear aircraft carriers to minesweepers and from large Naval air stations to seabee battalions. Over 150,000 individual surveys have been given and a large bank of computerized research data has been generated. Attempts have been made under the sponsorship of the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center to correlate the survey results with traditional measures of Navy organizational effectiveness. These evaluation efforts looked at criterion measures developed from the Navy Management of Maintenance and Materials System (3-M System), the Navy Status of

Forces operational reporting system (NAVFORSTAT), Navywide reelinstment rates, health records, safety reports, advancement statistics, awards earned, authorized absences and desertions and casualty reports. Promising tentative statistical results have been noted between survey indices and nonjudical punishment rates, incidence of drug abuse reports, and performance of ships undergoing refresher training (a post-overhaul training and evaluation period) (Thomas, 1975). Subjective HRM cycle reports from participating commanding officers have viewed the HRM cycle as being from GOOD to EXCELLENT in quality with the notable absence of any overall negative reports.

The present picture is clouded with the Navy Organization Development program's proportional share of personnel and fiscal cuts as well as mounting pressure to demonstrate its cost/benefit in a "hard" data form. The program image has also suffered by being erroneously connected by many individuals with the Navy's initial awareness program (Phase I) in Race Relations Education.

In the harsh light of budget competition, the Navy Organization Development effort faces its stiffest challenge --prove its worth or risk being abandoned. The effort is also not without its powerful critics, particularly those to whom social science knowledge is not quite respectfully "scientific." There are some doubts about the Navy's ability to provide effective quality control in such an extensive program. Also in question is whether or not the time requirements for involved commands are realistic and justifiable compared to other more operationally based priorities.

To date the Navy program would likely be labelled as non-OD by some purists in comparison with more traditional approaches. Although, as currently practiced, the HRM cycle contains elements of all three general human systems

change strategies identified by theorists Robert Chin and Kenneth Benne (Benne and Chin, 1968). These basic strategies include the Power-Coercive (Force based), Rational-Emperical (Information based), and Normative-Reeducative (Education based).

Using Beckhard's widely accepted definition of Organization Development (Beckhard, 1969) as a reference, the author's experience with the Navy approach stands in some elemental contrast. Beckhard defined Organization Development as an effort (1) planned, (2) organization wide, and (3) managed from the top, to (4) increase organization effectiveness and health through (5) planned interventions in the organization's "process," using behavior-science knowledge. In the Navy OD is an evolutionary semi-structured program that (1) has been often reactive as well as planned, (2) focuses mainly on lower echelon operational units as opposed to top hierarchial levels, (3) enjoys the general support of top commanders but is largely managed at much lower organization levels, (4) is still attempting to define "organization effectiveness and health," (5) employs emergent as well as carefully calculated interventions in organizational "processes," and (6) uses prior Navy experience, common sense, and other discipline inputs, as well as, behavioral science knowledge.

The status of the Navy's Organization Development effort today may be roughly likened to an anaolgy from meteorology. According to one often used sailor publication (Bowditch, 1962), Beaufort Scale Six (on a 17 point scale) is defined as, "Strong Breeze. Larger waves forming; whitecaps everywhere; more spray." The more intangible measures of modest success include an increasing number of requests from units for additional voluntary consultant services from HRMC/D's, scheduling of type commander staffs for

HRM cycles, moderate present and planned future funding levels, a continuing flow of top-performing officers and enlisted people as staff into the program, establishment of permanently assigned physical facilities, a priority space on busy operations schedules, and expressions of interest in the program from extra-Navy sources.

QUO VADIS: THE FUTURE

The Navy's OD effort is beginning to work with increasingly higher levels in the organizational hierarchy. The use of aggregated survey data to provide "big picture" information to commanders at the squadron, type, and fleet levels is growing in demand. Pressures continue to mount on HRMC's to develop broader scale analytical capacities and apply the principles of operations analysis to summarized survey data.

The employment of trend information as a diagnostic tool for the Navy as a macro-system is a distinct possibility in the near term future. The identification and utilization of a realistic set of evaluation standards keyed to survey difference values is also considered a probable future imperative directly related to program survival. There is a growing movement for more standardization of HRM Cycle events between all the HRMC's and HRMD's that would appear to support the efficiency of such an evaluation effort.

User units are becoming increasingly more sophisticated in their ability to utilize the available consultant services and to meaningfully interpret survey data. This sophistication is becoming ever more apparent as individuals and commands go through a second HRM cycle. A likely consequence of this second experience movement is a greater base of understanding and acceptance of the Navy OD process at the "grassroots" level.

The HRM cycle will, in all likelihood, continue to undergo evolutionary revision and improvement. One particularly promising improvement area is the joining of the discipline of Educational Technology with Organization Development (Forbes and Nickols, 1974).

As operational experience continues to mount, some consulting procedures are seen to be generally more effective than others. This growing body of experience, along with the almost paramount need for acceptable evaluative criteria, should result in increased intra-Navy, cross-service and cross-institution cooperation. This enhanced cooperation is likely to expand toward joint military service OD projects. Other possible outcomes are the establishment of mechanisms for the sharing of resources and for the use of accumulated knowledge.

A more effective feedback loop between the OD training system and the processes that are actually employed in the field will be required for the future. More advanced educational opportunities in the Navy OD field at the postgraduate level should soon become available. A Master's Degree program in Human Resource Management is now initially staffed and funded at the Naval Postgraduate School awaiting only final approval to be implemented.

The research data bank containing acculumated survey information should provide a rich source of future Navy organizational analysis studies. Realization of current data bank special projects is likely although its potential is still largely untapped and, as yet, not well understood.

Projects for special interest groups now underway and probable to continue include (Spruance, 1976):

1. The Chief of Naval Information has evaluated internal information sources.
2. The Judge Advocate General is evaluating the Uniform Code of Military Justice and non-judical punishment.
3. The Commander in Chief Pacific Fleet is analyzing personnel retention data.
4. The Chief of Naval Education and Training is evaluating the effectiveness of his leadership and management training, and
5. A safety analysis is soon to be conducted for the Naval Safety Center.

New data-derived, empirically-based tools are needed to help the Navy commanding officer to do his job more effectively. The link between research and practice will require further strengthening.

The future should also move Navy OD practitioners and their sponsors to a more careful scrutiny of their roles vis-a-vis the organization they service. This introspection may likely produce greater efforts to provide a more self-sustaining OD capability within each Navy unit with the eventual aim of moving the practitioner outof a job. Until that time comes, practical dilemmas remain to be worked through to help OD continue to help the Navy.

Many of these dilemmas seem to be common to OD efforts everywhere. It is the writer's hypothesis that as each organization seeks to clarify its stance relative to each dilemma, it helps to define the particular direction and meaning of the developmental process that is unique to that organization. Some of these key dilemmas that have been identified thus far are (Forbes, 1976):

1. Confidentiality vs disclosure. (Who can get to see what information?)
2. Marketing vs being asked. (Active or passive related to possible clientele?)
3. External vs internal direction. (Outside versus inside control of the effort?)
4. Top management participation vs top management approval. (What level of top support is necessary to success?)
5. Individual change focus vs organizational change focus. (Aim at the person or the system?)
6. Voluntary vs mandatory involvement. (Free choice or forced participation.)
7. Repair (maintenance) vs development. (Go for the short or long range payoff?)
8. Focus on people vs structure vs technology. (Where should the developmental emphasis be placed?)
9. Starting only at the top vs starting anywhere. (Where to begin?)

10. Planned vs emergent design. (Rationally structure the effort in advance or just let it happen naturally?)

11. Meeting organization needs vs meeting consultant needs. (Who is the real client?)

12. Organization values vs consultant values. (Is the organization's value structure consistent with the desired change goals?)

13. Line vs staff program management. (Who owns the program?)

14. "Buy it" vs "build it" OD capability. (Start from scratch or go with a "proven" product?)

15. Balance of consultant credibility vs skill. (What does an effective OD person look like?)

16. Focus on problems vs focus on opportunity. (Negative or positive developmental emphasis?)

17. "Soft" vs "hard" evaluation effort. (Subjective or objective basis for assessing results?)

EPILOG

This paper has attempted to look historically at the United States Navy's Organization Development programs. The initial developmental effort was seen to be mainly connected to the accelerating pace of technological and social change. The Navy, in common with other large institutions, has attempted to become responsive to both external and internally felt pressures.

Through the efforts of the top Navy leadership a pilot effort in human resource management was begun in 1971. The outgrowth of this effort was the "Command Development" program featuring a seven step approach to organization development. This approach was modified in 1973 into the Human Resource Management Cycle. The cycle incorporated many "lessons learned" from the previous program.

Details of the HRM Cycle including the HRAV week were discussed in some depth. Attempts to correlate survey results with traditional measures of organization effectiveness were noted along with a number of the current problems. Subjective measures of program success, as well as problem areas, were indicated. The present construction of the Navy change effort was brought into sharp contrast with Beckhard's more traditional definition of Organization Development.

Portents for the future of the Navy OD effort were listed and discussed. A series of organization development dilemmas were posed along with the hypothesis that their resolution defines OD for a particular organization.

Returning to the question posed at the outset by the title of this paper regarding where the Navy is going in Organization Development, this

writer would like to conclude with a summary comment made by a former Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy. Vice Admiral Calvert's words, written more than ten years ago, relating to the Navy's ultimate objectives seem equally suited to what the OD effort is really trying to accomplish today (Calvert, 1965).

> The Navy is an instrument of the United States; it exists to provide one of the means of attaining its national objectives. What are these objectives? Of the many possible answers, these few seem to me basic:
>
> 1. To maintain our way of life--particularly as it regards the dignity and freedom of the individual.
> 2. To maintain and, if possible, to improve our standard of living by taking intelligent steps to broaden the base and increase the vigor of our economy.
> 3. To maintain peace and create, insofar as possible, an atmosphere in which all nations may work together for the eventual achievement of a world in which individual nations need not maintain armed forces.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bagley, D. H. "Human Resource Management: An Application to Command." Speech to the Naval War College, October 4, 1971.

Beckhard, R., Organization Development: Strategies and Models. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Benne, K. and Chin, R., "General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems." in K. Benne, W. Bennis, and R. Chin, (Eds.), The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Bennis, W. R., Organization Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Propects. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Bergner, A. A. "Navy Retention from the Point of View of the Naval Training Center." Proceedings of the Conference on Personnel Retention Research, New Orleans, Louisiana, December, 1968. Washington, D. C.: Performance Research, 1969.

Bowditch, N. American Practical Navigator. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S., Corporate Excellence Through Grid Organizational Development. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company, 1968.

Bowers, D. G., "Work Organizations as Dynamic Systems." Technical Report of September 30, 1969, for the Office of Naval Research.

Bowers, D. G. and Franklin, J. L., Survey-Guided Development: Data-Based Organizational Change. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1975.

Calvert, J., "What Does the Navy Do?" The Naval Profession. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Drexler, J. A., "The Human Resource Management Survey: An Item Analysis." Report to the Office of Naval Research, 1974.

Drucker, P. W., Article in the Harvard Business Review, November-December, 1969.

Forbes, R. L., Option Bravo: A Planning Guide for a Human Resources Availability. San Diego, California: Human Resource Management Center, 1974.

Forbes, R. L., "What is OD?" Presentation to the Program for Specialists in Organization Development, Goodland, Florida, February 11, 1976.

Forbes, R. L. and Nickols, F. W., "Educational Technology and Organizational Development: A Collaborative Approach to Organizational Change." A paper presented at the 12th Annual NSPI Convention, Miama, Florida, April 18, 1974.

Franklin, J. L., "A Path Analytic Approach to Describing Causal Relationships Among Social-Psychological Factors in Multi-level Organizations." Report to the Office of Naval Research, 1973.

Hooper, C. C., Data Analysis Guide for the Navy Human Resource Management Survey. San Diego, California: Organizational Diagnostics Associates, 1974.

Kolb, D. A., and Frohman, A. L., "Organization Development Approach to Consulting." Sloan Management Review, Fall 1970.

Likert, R., New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Likert, R., The Human Organization, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Lyons, K. H., "Command Development Task Force Report." A letter to the Chief of Naval Personnel, March 5, 1973.

Michaelis, M., "The Management of Change." The Futurist, February 1971.

Mill, C. R., and Porter, L. C. (Eds.) Reading Book for Laboratories in Human Relations Training. Washington, D. C.: NTL Institute, 1972.

Pecrolla, P. A., Hausser, D. L., and Wissler, A. L., Survey Guided Development: A Consultant Manual for Human Resource Management Specialists (NAVPERS 15264). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Navy, 1974.

Schact, H. B., "The Impact of Change in the Seventies," Business Horizons, August, 1970.

Shear, H. E., "Navy Human Resource Management Support System." U. S. Navy, OPNAV Instruction 5300.6B of October 10, 1975.

Spruance, J. H., "The United States Navy Human Resource Management Support System: Challenges in the Field." A paper presented at the Inter-University Seminar, Arizona State University, February 27, 1976.

Taylor, J. C., and Bowers, D. G., Survey of Organizations: A Machine-scored Standardized Questionnaire Instrument. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1972.

Thomas, E. D., "Progress Report for FY-75: Human Goals Studies and Analysis Unit." Report prepared by the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, July, 1975.

U. S. Navy, The Navy "N": Integration of Men and Mission. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Naval Personnel, 1973.

U. S. Navy, "Confidentiality of Human Resource Management (HRM) Survey Information." Chief of Naval Operations Message issued March 7, 1974.

Weisner, M. F., "Navy Human Goals Plan." U. S. Navy OPNAV Instruction 5300.6 of August 6, 1973.

Zumwalt, E. R., "Human Resource Management." Chief of Naval Operations message issued November 4, 1970.

THE HRM WORKING PAPER SERIES

The series was established in 1977 as a way (1) to disseminate for the Navy and scholarly communities theoretical, polemic, proposal and research-type papers of interest to human resource management researchers and practitioners, (2) to cut the lengthy lag period between when an article is pending publication (or being submitted) and when it is distributed for "inside" consideration and use, (3) to promote the free sharing of ideas within the HRM community, some of which may not be publishable or officially sanctioned, and (4) to establish the HRM faculty at the Naval Postgraduate School as contributors to and monitors of a series of academic publications on military HRM.

While the working paper series predominantly reflects the work of the faculty at NPS, others practicing in the field (e.g. at a Human Resource Management Center) or in other services (e.g. at Air University) are welcome to submit appropriately typed and documented manuscripts for consideration. They will be reviewed by at least three of the HRM faculty at the Naval Postgraduate School for quality and relevance. Moreover, additions and modifications of the distribution list are encouraged. Please send any comments, criticisms or rejoinders directly to the authors of the various papers. Other communications would be welcomed by the editor.

C. Brooklyn Derr, Editor

DISTRIBUTION LIST

	Copies
Library, Code 0212 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Library, Code 54 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Dean of Research, Code 012 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Dean of Academic Planning, Code 013 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Department Chairman, Code 54 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
James K. Arima, Code 54Aa Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
C. Brooklyn Derr, Code 54Dr Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Carson K. Eoyang, Code 54Eg Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
LCDR Raymond L. Forbes, Jr., Code 54Fb Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
CDR Charles "Gus" Gustafson, Code 54Gs Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
William J. Haga, Code 54Hi Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Edward J. Lawrence, Code 56Lk Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	4
CDR Richard A. McGonigal, Code 54Mb Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1

	Copies
John D. Senger, Code 54Se Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Chester A. Wright, Code 54Wv Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	2
Bert King Office of Naval Research Organizational Effectiveness Program ONR -452 Ballston Center Tower #1 800 N. Qyuncy Street Arlington, VA 22304	1
Naval Personnel Research and Development Center Ed Thomas San Diego, CA 92152	1
Bureau of Naval Personnel (Pers 62, Pers 62.2, Pers 62.3, Pers 65) Arlington Annex Washington, DC 20370	4
Chief of Naval Personnel Washington, DC	1
Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel Pers 6 Washington, DC	1
Army Research Institute Commonwealth Bldg. 1300 Wilson Blvd. Rosslyn, VA 22209	1
Military Assistant for Human Resources OAD (E & LS) ODDR & E Pentagon 3D129 Washington, DC 20301	1
Human Performance Division, Code 44 Naval Medical R&D Command Bethesda, MD 20014	1
Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Research Office DAPE - PBR Washington, DC 20310	1

	Copies
Air University Library LSE - 8110 Maxwell AFB, AL 36112	1
Office of Civilian Manpower Management Personnel Management Evaluation Branch (72) Washington, DC 20390	1
Director, ETRPD, Code N-33 CNET Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL 32508	1
Director, Human Resources Research 713 Architect Bldg. 1400 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209	1
Chairman, Behavioral Science Department Naval Command and Management Division U.S. Naval Academy Luce Hall Annapolis, MD 21402	1
Management Department Navy War College Providence, RI 02840	1
Library U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, MD 21402	1
Library Navy War College Providence, RI 02840	1
Dr. Richard Elster, Pers-OR Bureau of Personnel Department of the Navy Washington, DC	1
Commanding Officer HRMC Washington, DC	1
Commanding Officer HRMD Naval Base Charleston, SC 29408	1
Commanding Officer National Naval Medical Center Bethesda, MD 20014	1

	Copies
Commanding Officer Naval Drug Rehab Center NAS Miramar San Diego, CA 92145	1
Commanding Officer Naval Drug Rehab Center NAS Jacksonville, FL 32212	1
Officer in Charge HRMD Defense Race Relations Patrick AFB, FL 32927	1
Commanding Officer Human Resource Management School NAS Memphis (96) Millington, TN 38054	2
Commanding Officer HRMC 5621-23 Tidewater Dr. Norfolk, VA 23509	2
Commander in Chief US Atlantic Fleet Norfolk, VA 23511	1
Officer in Charge HRMD Box 41 FPO NY 09540	1
Commanding Officer Naval Tech Training Center Corry Station Pensacola, FL 32508	1
Commanding Officer Naval Aviation Schools Command Bldg. 633 NAS Pensacola, FL 32508	1
Commanding Officer Navy Supply Corps Athens, GA 30601	1
Commanding Officer Naval Submarine Training Center FPO San Francisco, CA 96610	1

	Copies
Officer in Charge HRMD Box 3 FPO NY 09521	1
Commanding Officer HRMC London, England FPO NY 09510	2
Commanding Officer HRMC NTC GLAKES, IL 60088	1
Officer in Charge HRM Detachment NAS Jacksonville, FL 32212	1
Chief of Naval Tech Training NAS Memphis (75) Millington, TN 38054	1
Commanding Officer Fleet Training Center Norfolk, VA 23511	1
Commander in Chief US Pacific Fleet FPO San Francisco 96610	1
Commander in Chief US Naval Forces Europe FPO NY	1
Commander, Naval Air Force US Pacific Fleet NAS North Island San Diego, CA 92135	1
Commander, Naval Air Force US Atlantic Fleet Norfolk, CA 23511	1
Prospective Commander Naval Surface Force US Atlantic Fleet Norfolk, VA 23511	1
Commander, Amphibious Force US Pacific Fleet San Diego, CA 92155	1

	Copies
Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Force US Pacific Fleet San Diego, CA 92132	1
Commander, Service Force US Pacific Fleet FPO San Francisco 96610	1
Commander, Submarine Force US Atlantic Fleet Norfolk, VA 23511	1
Commander, Training Command US Pacific Fleet San Diego, CA 92147	1
Commander, Training Command US Atlantic Fleet Norfolk, VA 23511	1
Commanding Officer, Human Resource Management Det Naval Air Station Alameda, CA 94501	2
Commanding Officer, Human Resource Management Det Naval Base Charleston, SC 29408	1
Officer in Charge, HRMD Guam Box 200 FPO San Francisco 96630	1
Officer in Charge, HRMD NAS Jacksonville, FL 32212	1
Officer in Charge, HRMD US Naval Submarine Base, New London Groton, CT 06340	1
Officer in Charge, HRMD Box 41 FPO NY 09540	1
Officer in Charge, HRMD Rota Box 3 FPO NY 09521	1
Officer in Charge, HRMD Subic Bay US Naval Station FPO San Francisco 96651	1
Officer in Charge, HRMD Yokosuka Code 003 FPO Seattle 98762	1

	Copies
Commanding Officer, Officer Indoctrination School NETC Newport, RI 02840	1
Commanding Officer, Naval Drug Rehab Center Naval Base Great Lakes, IL 60088	1
Commanding Officer, Naval Drug Rehab Center Norfolk, VA 23511	1
Commander, Morocco US Naval Training Command FPO NY 09544	1
Commander, Naval Telecommunications Command Headquarters 4401 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Washington, DC 20390	1
Commander, Naval Security Group Command Naval Security Group Headquarters 3801 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20390	1
Officer in Charge, HRMD Box 12, Code 003 FPO Seattle 98762	1
Officer in Charge, HRMD US Naval Station FPO San Francisco 96651	1
Commanding Officer, HRMC NTC San Diego, CA 92133	2
Commander, Training Command US Pacific Fleet San Diego, CA 92147	1
Commanding Officer, HRMC Pearl Harbor FPO San Francisco 96610	2
Chief of Naval Reserve New Orleans, LA 70146	1
Deputy Director for Human Resources Department of the Air Force Washington, DC 20030	1
Mobilization Assistant HQ USAF/DPXHM Washington, DC 20330	1
Commanding Officer Leadership and Management Development Center Maxwell Air Force Base, AL 36112	1

	Copies
LTCOL Roger Manly Air Force Institute of Technology Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1
Officer in Charge HQ, Air Force Military Personnel Center Randolph AFB, TX 78148	1
Officer in Charge Air Force Human Resources Laboratory Lackland AFB, TX 78236	1
Dr. Kenneth J. Groves Department of the Air Force HQ Air University Maxwell AFB, AL 36112	1
LTCOL Denis D. Umstat Assistant Professor of Management School of Logistics and Management Air Force Institute of Technology Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1
Commander, U.S. Army Administration Center Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216	1
Director, Personnel Information System MILPERCEN 200 Stovall St. Alexandria, VA 22332	1
Chief, Human Resources Division ODCSPER HQ TRADOC Fort Monroe, VA 23651	1
COL Dandridge M. Malone U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013	1
Commandant, Organizational Effectiveness Training Center Fort Ord, CA 93941	2
COL Clarence A. Miller HQDA, ODCSPER Washington, DC 20310	1
Commander, U.S. Army Administration Center Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216	1
Director, Pers Info System MILPERCEN 200 Stovall Street Alexandria, VA 22332	1

	Copies
Chief, Human Resources Division ODCSPER, HQ TRADOC Fort Monroe, VA 23651	1
Director Human Resources HHC XVIII ABN Corps Fort Bragg, NC 28307	1
Senior R&D Coordinator U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavior and Social Sciences 1300 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209	1
Assistant Commandant U.S. Army Sergeants Major Academy Fort Bliss, TX 79918	1
Chief, Human Resources Division ODCSPER AFPE-HR HQ Forces Command Fort McPherson, GA 30330	1
Leadership and Notivation Division ODCSPER HQDA Washington, DC 20310	1
Dr. Mel Spehn Director of Developments U.S. Army OE Training Center Fort Ord, CA 93941	1
CAPT James E. Wilson Assistant for Plans and Policy ODASD (EO) Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301	1
CDR Richard J. Marcott USCG RESTRACEN Yorktown, VA 23690	1
BG Richard C. Schulze Director, Personnel Procurement HQ USMC Washington, DC 20380	1
COL Dennis J. Murphy Manpower Plans and Policy Division Quantico, VA 22134	1


GAYLORD S